



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/897,162	06/29/2001	Jason E. Black	MS1-741US	1458
22801 7590 03/23/2007 LEE & HAYES PLLC 421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500 SPOKANE, WA 99201			EXAMINER THERIAULT, STEVEN B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2179	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	03/23/2007	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Notice of this Office communication was sent electronically on the above-indicated "Notification Date" and has a shortened statutory period for reply of 3 MONTHS from 03/23/2007.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

lhptoms@leehayes.com

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/897,162

Applicant(s)

BLACK ET AL.

Examiner

Steven B. Theriault

Art Unit

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 January 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 18-24 and 26-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 18-24 and 26-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the following communications: Amendment filed on 01/05/2007.

**This action is made final.**

2. Claims 1-16, 18-24 and 26-40 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 10, 19, 26, and 32 are the independent and amended claims. Claims 17 and 25 have been cancelled.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. **The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:**

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-2, 4-11, 13-16, 18-24 and 32-40 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sennett et al. (hereinafter Sennett) U.S. Patent No. 6,400,940 issued June 4, 2002 and filed Oct. 22, 1997, in view of Kraft, et al (hereinafter Kraft) U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0198965 issued Dec. 26, 2002 and filed June 26, 2001.**

**In the present application specification, the applicant has defined the context sensitive help as generally answering context sensitive questions with respect to the object of interest such as "what is this object", or "why would I use this object" (See specification page 2, Para 1, lines 1-8). The examiner has relied on this definition for the following rejection.**

In regard to **Independent claim 1**, Sennett teaches a method for providing context-sensitive help from a first computer to a second computer for a Web-based user interface (UI) of the first computer, the method comprising:

Art Unit: 2179

- Receiving a request for context sensitive help at the first computer from the second computer, the request corresponding to a first Web page of a Web-based UI of the first computer, the first Web page comprising a user-interface object, the request for context-sensitive help being based on a "what is the user-interface object?" or a "Why would I use the user-interface object?" question type, the user interface object corresponding to a function of the first computer that is remotely operable by way of the second computer (Sennett column 2, lines 21-35 and column 4, lines 15-35 and 47-60) Sennett teaches a process of presenting information in a browser window on a hand held device that is a second computer. The information is received from a first computer (See figure 1, 15). The information presented to the user is context-sensitive and directed to teach the user how to enter information into the device or how to read a text message.
- Responsive to receiving the request for the context sensitive help, the first computer: determining a set of context sensitive information that corresponds to the first Web page, the determining based at least in part on a unique ID of the first web-page (Sennett column 3, lines 35-57) Sennett teaches the receiving of context –sensitive information that corresponds to the first web page based on the user id and profile (See column 4, lines 1-3).
- Generating a second Web page comprising the context sensitive information, the generating including determining and performing any required modifications to the set of context sensitive information in accordance with compatibility criteria of the second computer (Sennett column 4, lines 1-3 and 15-32) Sennett teaches the system determines from the user profile and the device profile whether any modification to the context information presented to the phone needs to be tailored (See also column 3, lines 45-67).

Sennett does not expressly teach:

- Providing the second Web page to the second computer for presentation, wherein: the web-based UI of the first computer corresponds to remotely managing one or more of a disk, a volume, a user, a user group, or a directory of the first computer (Hennum Para 0014-0024) Hennum teaches the web server returns a web page in response to the request from the first page.

Sennett teaches that the Internet services can be remotely located from the IP platform within the system but does not teach remotely managing as recited in the claim. However, Kraft teaches a system for remotely managing a disk, and a directory of a remote computer through a virtual desktop that is access from a computing device through a browser (See Para 0025, 0029 and 0044). Kraft also teaches the process was created to provide support and help services to users. Sennett and Kraft are analogous art because they provide mechanisms for accessing information from remote locations and providing information to a user in the remote location for managing a device.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention having the teaching of Kraft and Sennett in front of them to modify the system of Sennett to allow a user to log into a virtual desktop to server to manage another device through a browser. The motivation to combine comes from the suggestion in Kraft that the mobile computing device of Kraft can be a cell phone and that the purpose of accessing the virtual system to manage a file directory (See Para 0015) through a single interface is to help the user by maintaining a consistent interface and providing user help through a virtual server.

With respect to **dependent claim 2**, Sennett teaches a method wherein the first computer is a server appliance (Sennett Fig 1) Sennett teaches the receiving computer is a server.

With respect to **dependent claim 4**, Sennett teaches a method before receiving the request, further comprising: communicating, by the first computer, a Web-based UI to the second computer, the first computer being operatively coupled over a network to the second computer, the Web-based UI comprising a first Web page corresponding to one or more predetermined functions of the first computer (Sennett column 4, lines 15-32). Sennett teaches information is communicated over a network from a first browser, to a second where the information covering the device is visible to the user on how to enter information into their phone and how to save numbers.

With respect to **dependent claim 5**, Sennett teaches a method further comprising: responsive to determining the context sensitive help information, retrieving the context sensitive help information from one or more help files (Sennett column 4, lines 32-67)

With respect to **dependent claim 6**, Sennett teaches a method, before receiving the request, further comprising: communicating, by the first computer, a Web-based UI to the second computer, the first computer being operatively coupled over a network to the second computer, the Web-based UI comprising a first Web page corresponding to one or more predetermined functions of the first computer, the first Web page comprising a unique ID and a persistent help object that is mapped to a URL of the first computer, the URL comprising the unique ID; and wherein determining the context sensitive help information is based on the unique ID (Sennett column 3, lines 35-57) Sennett teaches the receiving of context –sensitive information that corresponds to the first web page based on the user id and profile (See column 4, lines 1-3). Further, the given ID of the page would be matched to the device as both the user profile and the device profile are gathered to tailor the information pertaining to the functions of the device. Without the ID, the system would send information that would not pertain to the device.

Art Unit: 2179

With respect to **dependent claims 7 and 8**, as indicated in the above discussion Sennett in view of Kraft teaches every limitation of claim 1.

Sennett does not expressly teach a method wherein the URL further comprises a reference to one or more computer programs on the first computer; and wherein the operations of determining the context-sensitive help and retrieving the context sensitive help are performed by the one or more computer programs that use a server-side scripting interface and the server side scripting generates dynamic help. However, this limitation would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, in view of Kraft, because Kraft allows the user to access one or more applications via the virtual server on the first computer. Sennett teaches the use of server side scripting of a tailored web page based on user features of a give cell-phone that can also be dynamic. Kraft teaches that a small computing device can access the virtual server for the purposes of managing a host of applications from a single location and therefore is the motivation to combine the references.

With respect to **dependent claim 9**, Sennett teaches a computer readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions for performing a method as recited in claim 1(Sennett column 3, lines 23-41).

In regard to **claims 10-11, 13-16, 18**, claims 10-11, 13-16, 18 reflect the computer readable medium comprising computer instructions for performing the method steps of claims 1-2, 4-9, respectively, and are thus rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to **claims 19-24**, claims 19-24 reflect the system comprising computer instructions for performing the method steps of claims 1, 4-7, respectively, and in further view of the following, are rejected along the same rationale. Sennett teaches that the menu driven on the browser application has been tailored to the device features to provide help to the user (See column 4, lines 4-15) and would have to persist to allow the user to make multiple selections on the device.

Art Unit: 2179

The help object is a browser window with the context specific information. The system performs dynamic lookups for the given device when it logs on to the system when it collects the device profile and then tailors the content to the given device.

In regard to **claims 32-40**, claims 32-40 reflect substantially similar subject matter as the method steps of claims 1-2, 4-6, respectively, and in further view of the following, are rejected along the same rationale. Sennett teaches the process of performing modifications to the second web page based on the profile of the requesting device (See column 3, lines 50-57 and column 4, lines 45-56). Sennett in view of Kraft teaches a process of allowing the user to access one or more application types from within a virtual server on the server which would provide for a server side scripting interface and a system that provides help information on those programs using remote terminal software on a server and for providing dynamic content as the user switches between application to application.

5. **Claims 26-28, 30-31 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over anticipated by Hennum et al. (hereinafter Hennum) U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0054138 issued May 9, 2002 and filed Dec. 4, 2000, in view of Kraft, et al (hereinafter Kraft) U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0198965 issued Dec. 26, 2002 and filed June 26, 2001.**

In regard to **Independent claim 26**, Hennum teaches a user interface embodied in a computer-readable storage medium for providing context-sensitive help for a remote user interface (UI), the user interface comprising:

- A first area in a web page for displaying, on a first device, a remote UI that corresponds to a second device the remote UI comprising a user-interface object, and corresponding to at least one function of the second device that is remotely operable by way of the first device (Hennum Figure 4 and 9) Hennum teaches a first area in a web page on a client where a function on the server (hyperlink information or applet) is remotely operable by way of the second device.



Art Unit: 2179

- A second area within the first area for providing a context-sensitive help control for accessing a set of context sensitive help to answer a "What is the user-interface object?" or a "Why would I use the user-interface object?" question type (Hennum Para 0014-0024) Hennum teaches a process of presenting information in a first browser window and upon selection of a link in the first window a request is sent to an web server which returns a web-page to a second browser window that contains context sensitive information. Hennum teaches a process of relating the context information on how to use the application to achieve the desired goal and how to control the feature within the application, which are examples of "why would I use the interface object". Hennum teaches a user receives information in one embodiment for a web application and then a second application (word basic).

Hennum does not expressly teach:

- The remote UI corresponds to remotely managing one or more of a disk, a volume, a user, a user group, or a directory of the second device.

However, Kraft teaches a system for remotely managing a disk, and a directory of a remote computer through a virtual desktop that is access from a computing device through a browser (See Para 0025, 0029 and 0044). Kraft also teaches the process was created to provide support and help services to users. Hennum and Kraft are analogous art because they provide mechanisms for accessing information from remote as remote server that manages help information.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention having the teaching of Kraft and Hennum in front of them to modify the system of Hennum to allow a user to log into a virtual desktop to server to manage another device through a browser. The motivation to combine comes from the suggestion in Kraft that the mobile computing device of Kraft can be a cell phone and that the purpose of accessing the virtual

Art Unit: 2179

system to manage a file directory (See Para 0015) through a single interface is to help the user by maintaining a consistent interface and providing user help through a virtual server.

With respect to **dependent claim 27**, Hennum teaches a user interface wherein the context-sensitive help control is a representation of a question mark (Hennum Figure 4).

With respect to **dependent claim 28**, Hennum teaches a user interface, wherein the context-sensitive help control is mapped to a URL that comprises a unique ID that corresponds to a particular Web page of the Web-based UI, the unique ID referencing the context-sensitive help (Hennum Para 0015 and 0090) Hennum teaches the URL of the first computer has a topic identifier that is mapped to the display in the second computer and where the URL address points to a location of the information and the context sensitive information is derived from the clicked link as it determined from the topic information.

With respect to **dependent claim 30**, Hennum teaches a user interface wherein the second device is a server appliance (Hennum Para 0005 and 0022) Hennum teaches the receiving computer is a server.

With respect to **dependent claim 31**, Hennum teaches a computer comprising a processor that is operatively coupled to a memory comprising computer-executable instructions for displaying a user interface (Hennum Para 0003 and 0096).

Art Unit: 2179

6. **Claims 3 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sennett in view of Kraft as applied to claims 1-2, 4-8- 10-16, 18-24 and 32-40 above, and further in view of Sullivan et al (hereinafter Sullivan).**

With respect to **dependent claims 3 and 12**, as indicated in the above discussion, Sennett in view of Kraft teaches every element of claims 1, and 10.

Sennett in view of Kraft does not expressly teach a *method wherein generating the second Web page further comprises: generating the second Web page in a format that is compatible with a platform of the second computer the platform comprising a hardware platform, an operating system platform, a web browser type indication, a software version indication, a preferred language indication, an intended use of the second computer, and/or predetermined preferences of a user* (Hennum Para 0014-0024)

Sennett in view of Kraft does teach that a variety of phone systems can be utilized and that a variety of devices can access the system but does not expressly teach all of the limitation of claims 3 and 12. However, in the same field of endeavor of providing help to a user via a web page, Sullivan teaches a process of generating from a request from a first web page a second web page that is formatted based on the operating system of the computer, the hardware, web browser type and the software version, and intended user of the computer and the language or location of the user on the planet (See Figures 1-12 and column 3, lines 20-67). Sennett, Kraft, and Sullivan teach mechanisms for retrieving interface information on how to use the interface and information on steps to perform in the interface.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention having the teaching of Sennett, Kraft and Sullivan in front of them to modify the help system of Sennett and Kraft with the system of Sullivan for the purposes of generating system information that is compatible with the first computer and displaying the information to the user.

Art Unit: 2179

The motivation to combine Sennett, Kraft with Sullivan comes from the expressed teaching in Sullivan that self service help applications provide a guided user interaction to the appropriate subset of relevant information for the purposes of performing a function with guidance (See column 1 and 2), which is information and information can be about the system the browser is running in.

7. **Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hennum in view of Kraft as applied to claims 26-31 above, and further in view of Sullivan et al.**

With respect to **dependent claim 29**, as indicated in the above discussion, Hennum in view of Kraft teaches every element of claim 26.

Hennum in view of Kraft does not expressly teach a *method wherein generating the second Web page further comprises: generating the second Web page in a format that is compatible with a platform of the second computer the platform comprising a hardware platform, an operating system platform, a web browser type indication, a software version indication, a preferred language indication, an intended use of the second computer, and/or predetermined preferences of a user* (Hennum Para 0014-0024)

However, in the same field of endeavor of providing help to a user via a web page, Sullivan teaches a process of generating from a request from a first web page a second web page that is formatted based on the operating system of the computer, the hardware, web browser type and the software version, and intended user of the computer and the language or location of the user on the planet (See Figures 1-12 and column 3, lines 20-67). Hennum, Kraft, and Sullivan teach mechanisms for retrieving interface information on how to use the interface and information on steps to perform in the interface.

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention having the teaching of Hennum, Kraft and Sullivan in front of them to modify the help system of Sennett and Kraft with the system of Sullivan for the purposes of generating system information that is compatible with the first computer and displaying the information to the

Art Unit: 2179

user. The motivation to combine Hennum, Kraft with Sullivan comes from the expressed teaching in Sullivan that self service help applications provide a guided user interaction to the appropriate subset of relevant information for the purposes of performing a function with guidance (See column 1 and 2), which is information and information can be about the system the browser is running in.

**It is noted that any citation to specific, pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).**

### ***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-16, 18-24 and 26-31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be

Art Unit: 2179

calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven B. Theriault whose telephone number is (571) 272-5867. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30 - 4:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (571) 272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SBT



**WEILUN LO**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**